

College

Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

EDITOR

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, *Purdue University*

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, *Duke University*; LOUIS FORSDALE, *Teachers College, Columbia University*; W. NELSON FRANCIS, *Franklin and Marshall College*; STEWART S.

MORGAN, *The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas*; PORTER

G. PERRIN, *University of Washington*; SAMUEL WEINGARTEN,

Chicago City Junior College, Wright Branch

PERIODICALS

OCT 24 1955

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Vol. IV

October, 1953

No. 3

Workshop Reports of the 1953 Conference on College Composition and Communication

Meeting March 13, 14, The Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Illinois

FROM A STUDENT'S READING TO HIS WRITING AND SPEAKING.....	75
THE TERMINAL STUDENT.....	77
NATIONAL ENTRANCE TESTS AND MINIMUM STANDARDS.....	79
PREPARATION OF THE COMPOSITION OR COMMUNICATION TEACHER.....	81
SUB-FRESHMAN COMPOSITION—THE POORLY-EQUIPPED STUDENT.....	83
SUPER-FRESHMAN COMPOSITION—THE WELL-EQUIPPED STUDENT.....	85
USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN TEACHING FRESHMAN ENGLISH.....	88
STATUS IN THE PROFESSION OF THE COMPOSITION TEACHER.....	89
IMPROVING READING ABILITY.....	91
THE ABC'S OF THE COMBINATION OF WRITING AND ORAL COMMUNICATION.....	93
WRITING FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY.....	94
INTEGRATION OF HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION.....	96
THE MASS MEDIA OF COMMUNICATION.....	100
CLINICAL AIDS TO FRESHMAN ENGLISH.....	102
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS.....	104
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE STUDENT: HOW HE LEARNS TO COMMUNICATE.....	105
CCCC BULLETIN BOARD.....	108

College Composition and Communication is published quarterly in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter June 28, 1950, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to W. Wilbur Hatfield, 8110 South Halsted Street, Chicago 20, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to George S. Wykoff, University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

National Council of Teachers of English Conference on College Composition and Communication

1953 OFFICERS

KARL W. DYKEMA, Chairman
Youngstown College

T. A. BARNHART, Associate Chairman
State Teachers College, St. Cloud

JEROME W. ARCHER, Assistant Chairman
Marquette University

BEVERLY E. FISHER, Secretary
Santa Monica City College

W. WILBUR HATFIELD, Treasurer
8110 South Halsted St., Chicago

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, Editor
Purdue University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Universities

HAROLD B. ALLEN, Minnesota

RICHARD S. BEAL, Boston Univ.

GEORGE P. FAUST, Kentucky

IRWIN GRIGGS, Temple

JOHN C. HODGES, Tennessee

GLENN H. LEGGETT, Washington

HENRY W. SAMS, Chicago

FRANCIS SHOEMAKER, Teachers College,
Columbia

MCDONALD WILLIAMS, Wilberforce

KARL YOUNG, Brigham Young

Liberal Arts Colleges

WAYNE C. BOOTH, Haverford

L. A. KING, Muskingum

STRANG LAWSON, Colgate

CARL LEFEVRE, Pace

JAMES H. MASON, Indian Springs School

SISTER MIRIAM JOSEPH, C.S.C., St. Mary's
(Indiana)

WATERS TURPIN, Morgan State

F. EARL WARD, Macalester

Teachers Colleges

PAUL W. BARRUS, East Texas State

WILLIAM T. BEAUCHAMP, Geneseo

JEAN MALMSTROM, Western Michigan
College of Education

KATHERINE SCOTT, Georgia State College
for Women

Technical Schools

HOWARD R. BARTLETT, Mass. Inst. Tech.
EMMA BEEKMAN, Los Angeles Trade and
Tech.

T. J. FARR, Tenn. Polytech. Inst.

HERBERT B. NELSON, Oregon State

ROBERT E. TUTTLE, General Motors Inst.

Junior Colleges

DONALD BIRD, Stephens

GLADYS BROWN, Little Rock

JOSIAH L. GEIST, Wright

GORDON MILLS, Los Angeles

MARGUERITE H. MOREY, Colby Jr.

Workshop Reports of the 1953 Conference on College Composition and Communication

From a Student's Reading and Listening to His Writing and Speaking

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 1

The workshop initiated its discussion with the question of suitable theme assignments: Should students' themes develop from their day-to-day experiences? from readings in imaginative literature? from consideration of contemporary social and political issues? from philosophic, moral or religious dilemmas? From this discussion two basic problems were brought to light:

1. What educational objective do we seek to achieve in students' writing and speaking?

2. What types of reading (and listening) materials will best stimulate written and oral expression?

In connection with the first problem, it was suggested that the educational objective was related to the overall objective in a general education program—to prepare the students to take a productive role in a democratic society. As a consequence, therefore, the larger part of the workshop group agreed that the materials of an introductory course in composition and communication are means and not ends in themselves, that the function of the course is to enable students to communicate effectively not only because effective communication is a fundamental basis for academic success but because it is usually an indispensable tool in the successful pursuit of an ultimate profession and in the discharge of responsibilities as a citizen in a democratic state.

Since the colleges today are operating for the benefit of an ever-widening base of students—Robert J. Havighurst in the

Fifty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education anticipates that twenty-five percent of the nation's youth will soon be attending some kind of institution of higher learning—it is realistic to regard freshman composition as a basic course in communication skills. With this idea in mind, the majority of the workshop participants rejected the notion that freshman English should be a course in imaginative literature or belles lettres whose by-product is student writing.

Imaginative literature, on the other hand, was generally regarded as one of the chief resources for stimulating effective writing. But bearing in mind that not all students equally react on paper to their reading of imaginative literature, the workshop considered alternate means of stimulating effective writing and oral discussion.

At the outset of a communication skills course, in line with stressing the objective of *informal* writing and speaking, the injunction of S. I. Hayakawa (at the 1949 CCCC) was recalled: that students should be given the sense of communicating not only to higher authority (the instructor and judge) but to a discriminating body of their peers.

It was the workshop's attitude that student expression is best realized initially when it deals with the concrete rather than the abstract. As a consequence, the workshop generally agreed that early themes in the course should be expository in type and based mainly on the students' personal experiences and

observations. The student's ability (or inability) to write with unity, emphasis, and coherence is made most apparent to him and to his classmates when he is faced with the problem of explaining how something works or how to do something. For if his explanation comes across, he has realized an important step in successful communication; if the explanation is unclear, the teacher and the class are in a position to analyze in what respect the student has failed to master the technique of communication.

Concomitant with this activity, of course, is the reading of expository prose with analysis of those elements which make the exposition lucid, unified, and *readable*. The process of analyzing assigned examples of expository prose in conjunction with the close evaluation of students' expository themes should lead to an early achievement of discipline in organization and focus.

It is at this point, the workshop felt,

that the student can better profit from a wider and more varied type of reading: essays and stories drawn from both classical and contemporary sources; imaginative literature, including poetry and the novel. To all of these the teacher might add those radio and television discussions which embrace current and relevant issues.

The teacher, however, in using whatever resources he considers most appropriate, will not lose sight of the fact that the students' readings are selected with the idea that they can be transmuted into thoughts and feelings lying close to the students' personal experiences. Ideas which the student considers remote and unrelated to himself rarely provide the fabric for a successful theme. To produce good writing and speaking, the workshop believes that the reading and listening materials must be such as will generate the students' interest and enthusiasm.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 1

Chairman: Samuel Weingarten, Wright Junior College, Chicago
Co-Chairman: Howard A. Wilson, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois
Secretary: Richard H. Goldstone, University of Kentucky, Lexington
Co-Secretary: Adrian H. Jaffee, Michigan State College, East Lansing
 Sister Mary Aquin, O. F., Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan
 Myron Beebe, Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa
 Agnes V. Boner, Montana State University, Missoula
 Gladys K. Brown, Little Rock Junior College, Little Rock, Arkansas
 Virginia M. Burke, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee
 Sister Mary Celestine, Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin
 Sister Mary Corda, Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin
 Sister Miriam Clare, O. S. F., St. Francis College, Joliet, Illinois
 Sister Mary Doris, O. S. F., Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Nina Draxten, General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Florence Eldredge, Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois
 Wallace Garneau, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

Virginia Harlow, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Indiana
 Dorothy C. Hockey, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
 Sister Mary Jessine, O. S. F., Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Winona Kell, Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Illinois
 Eleanore Lane, Arkansas State College, State College
 Marie A. Matt, Rochester Junior College, Rochester, Minnesota
 Katherine T. Moyer, Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio
 S. C. Niederman, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 John Ostrom, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio
 Sister Mary Paul, O. P., Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois
 Robert M. Rodney, Northeastern Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville
 Sister Romaine, S. S. J., Villa Maria College, Erie, Pennsylvania
 Sister Mary Seraphim, St. Francis College, Joliet, Illinois
 Agnes Serum, State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
 Erma Simmons, Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas

The Terminal Student

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 2

Early in the discussion, the workshop members recognized that "terminal student" is not only an undefined and nearly undefinable term—since students cannot be relied on to stay terminated—but also a needlessly offensive one. In the minds of teachers it tends to connote inferior ability.

On the whole, the workshop members felt that the separation of "university" students from "terminal" students was extremely tenuous, even dangerous, and that it would be much better to arrive at a university program on the freshman-sophomore level based upon objectives desirable for the total student population.

Further discussion revealed that most explicitly terminal programs are either general or vocational in nature. It was pointed out that emphasis on vocational education increases the difficulty of motivating such general courses as literature or the humanities. Moreover, vocational training itself has a very limited value in modern industry, although distinctly profitable for a few types of technicians. Co-operative work programs, in which the vocational training is of the "on-the-job" type, have been found to aggravate the problem of drop-outs.

In only one case, that of Minnesota, was general education for the terminal student treated separately from that offered to other students. More often, a unified limited-elective curriculum is provided in the first two years for all students.

What is the role of English in such a program? It was agreed that it should be a basic requirement for all except those who pass an exemption test. Further, nearly all the schools represented provided either a sub-freshman composition course, or a system of freshman courses

pitched at different levels—in one case, as many as four. Techniques involved in these special courses received some attention from the workshop members.

In line with the current trend toward communications, many schools emphasize oral skills in their freshman programs. Santa Monica accepts a speech course as an alternative to freshman composition. Rochester has a five-hour course for students at the lower level of ability which is divided among three teachers, in the areas of reading, writing, and speaking. The use of speech in the composition course is a valuable means of combating the overemphasis which students tend to place on handbook grammar, vocabulary building, etc., which appear to them to be royal roads to success in business. Some teachers had the impression that students are more fluent in speech than in writing; however, the fact that teachers tend to be trained in literature only may introduce a difference in their standards of which they are unaware.

The crucial role of reading in freshman composition was agreed upon by all. One of many significant developments was the use of non-fiction books for outside reading assignments, e.g., at Lyons Township Junior College. There it is felt that this furthers the desirable correlation of English with other subjects, and in addition has a special value in motivating the non-reader. However, there are not enough suitable materials in the natural sciences.

Remedial or developmental reading courses are seldom found under English departments. The experience of the group suggested that, as courses, they have the disadvantage of seeming to relieve teachers of other subjects of the burden of teaching reading; and all the

observations. The student's ability (or inability) to write with unity, emphasis, and coherence is made most apparent to him and to his classmates when he is faced with the problem of explaining how something works or how to do something. For if his explanation comes across, he has realized an important step in successful communication; if the explanation is unclear, the teacher and the class are in a position to analyze in what respect the student has failed to master the technique of communication.

Concomitant with this activity, of course, is the reading of expository prose with analysis of those elements which make the exposition lucid, unified, and *readable*. The process of analyzing assigned examples of expository prose in conjunction with the close evaluation of students' expository themes should lead to an early achievement of discipline in organization and focus.

It is at this point, the workshop felt,

that the student can better profit from a wider and more varied type of reading: essays and stories drawn from both classical and contemporary sources; imaginative literature, including poetry and the novel. To all of these the teacher might add those radio and television discussions which embrace current and relevant issues.

The teacher, however, in using whatever resources he considers most appropriate, will not lose sight of the fact that the students' readings are selected with the idea that they can be transmuted into thoughts and feelings lying close to the students' personal experiences. Ideas which the student considers remote and unrelated to himself rarely provide the fabric for a successful theme. To produce good writing and speaking, the workshop believes that the reading and listening materials must be such as will generate the students' interest and enthusiasm.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 1

Chairman: Samuel Weingarten, Wright Junior College, Chicago

Co-Chairman: Howard A. Wilson, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois

Secretary: Richard H. Goldstone, University of Kentucky, Lexington

Co-Secretary: Adrian H. Jaffee, Michigan State College, East Lansing

Sister Mary Aquin, O. F., Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Myron Beebe, Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa

Agnes V. Boner, Montana State University, Missoula

Gladys K. Brown, Little Rock Junior College, Little Rock, Arkansas

Virginia M. Burke, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee

Sister Mary Celestine, Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin

Sister Mary Corda, Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin

Sister Miriam Clare, O. S. F., St. Francis College, Joliet, Illinois

Sister Mary Doris, O. S. F., Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Nina Draxten, General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Florence Eldredge, Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois

Wallace Garneau, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

Virginia Harlow, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Indiana

Dorothy C. Hockey, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Sister Mary Jessine, O. S. F., Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Winona Kell, Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Illinois

Eleanore Lane, Arkansas State College, State College

Marie A. Matt, Rochester Junior College, Rochester, Minnesota

Katherine T. Moyer, Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio

S. C. Niederman, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago

John Ostrom, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio

Sister Mary Paul, O. P., Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois

Robert M. Rodney, Northeastern Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville

Sister Romaine, S. S. J., Villa Maria College, Erie, Pennsylvania

Sister Mary Seraphim, St. Francis College, Joliet, Illinois

Agnes Serum, State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Erma Simmons, Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas

The Terminal Student

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 2

Early in the discussion, the workshop members recognized that "terminal student" is not only an undefined and nearly undefinable term—since students cannot be relied on to stay terminated—but also a needlessly offensive one. In the minds of teachers it tends to connote inferior ability.

On the whole, the workshop members felt that the separation of "university" students from "terminal" students was extremely tenuous, even dangerous, and that it would be much better to arrive at a university program on the freshman-sophomore level based upon objectives desirable for the total student population.

Further discussion revealed that most explicitly terminal programs are either general or vocational in nature. It was pointed out that emphasis on vocational education increases the difficulty of motivating such general courses as literature or the humanities. Moreover, vocational training itself has a very limited value in modern industry, although distinctly profitable for a few types of technicians. Co-operative work programs, in which the vocational training is of the "on-the-job" type, have been found to aggravate the problem of drop-outs.

In only one case, that of Minnesota, was general education for the terminal student treated separately from that offered to other students. More often, a unified limited-elective curriculum is provided in the first two years for all students.

What is the role of English in such a program? It was agreed that it should be a basic requirement for all except those who pass an exemption test. Further, nearly all the schools represented provided either a sub-freshman composition course, or a system of freshman courses

pitched at different levels—in one case, as many as four. Techniques involved in these special courses received some attention from the workshop members.

In line with the current trend toward communications, many schools emphasize oral skills in their freshman programs. Santa Monica accepts a speech course as an alternative to freshman composition. Rochester has a five-hour course for students at the lower level of ability which is divided among three teachers, in the areas of reading, writing, and speaking. The use of speech in the composition course is a valuable means of combating the overemphasis which students tend to place on handbook grammar, vocabulary building, etc., which appear to them to be royal roads to success in business. Some teachers had the impression that students are more fluent in speech than in writing; however, the fact that teachers tend to be trained in literature only may introduce a difference in their standards of which they are unaware.

The crucial role of reading in freshman composition was agreed upon by all. One of many significant developments was the use of non-fiction books for outside reading assignments, e.g., at Lyons Township Junior College. There it is felt that this furthers the desirable correlation of English with other subjects, and in addition has a special value in motivating the non-reader. However, there are not enough suitable materials in the natural sciences.

Remedial or developmental reading courses are seldom found under English departments. The experience of the group suggested that, as courses, they have the disadvantage of seeming to relieve teachers of other subjects of the burden of teaching reading; and all the

participants subscribed to the philosophy of "every teacher a teacher of reading," as promulgated in *The English Language Arts* and elsewhere.

One method of encouraging this is represented by the experimental course at Gary, entitled "Orientation in College Aims and Methods." It includes a series of ten lectures, by various staff members, in Psychology, Composition, History, Government, Sociology, Mathematics, Business, Physical Science, and Literature, each lecture being followed by discussions in which not more than five or six students discuss with another teacher the aims and methods of the subject, the students' reactions, and problems in the subject. About half the lectures treat analytical reading in the subject field, most of the rest generalized techniques of problem-solving.

Various workshop members pointed out that such a procedure implies the assumption that college courses should be integrated, and ascribes to general education the highest value.

It was generally agreed that reading should be included in all English courses for the terminal student; and, since time for this is necessarily brief, the responsibility of other teachers for reading must be emphasized. In the English course, comprehension of ideas was named the most important skill to be achieved, but reading assignments are intended not only to improve reading skill but also to stimulate discussion and writing, and to develop powers of criticism and analysis.

In the area of writing, workshop members emphasized the importance of having something to say, the ability to build a prose statement with a central purpose in mind, and to sort details into their proper relations.

It was also agreed that if ideas are to be expressed, they must be expressed to someone, and that the writer has a real

responsibility to present his thoughts effectively and economically. From this point of view, incorrect or non-standard grammar and mechanics constitute impediments to expression. Hence if communication is important to the student, he will accept responsibility not only for his ideas but also for the correct expression of his ideas. In this environment, there may be some hope of overcoming the verbal poverty of eye and ear, which, workshop members reported, prevails almost universally.

In a student-centered program, concerned with the problems and interests and needs of the student, communication becomes a fruitful teaching experience. Teachers must insist, however, that the student take himself seriously, and that his problems should be worth thinking and writing and talking about. If a mature level of thinking is maintained, students will find many avenues of communication provocative.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 2

- Chairman:** Leon Reisman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Co-Chairman: Beverly Fisher, Santa Monica City College, Santa Monica, California
Secretary: Daniel Albright, Indiana University, Gary Center, Gary
 Louise Berthelemy, Rochester Junior College, Rochester, Minnesota
 Aileen C. Dougherty, Lyons Township Junior College, La Grange, Illinois
 Mildred B. Freeman, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 May Louise Heller, La-Salle-Peru-Oglesby Junior College, La Salle, Illinois
 J. Howard Hill, Vincennes University, Junior College, Vincennes, Indiana
 Eugene Lavine, Austin Junior College, Austin, Minnesota
 Sister Leocadia, O. P., Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart, Madison, Wisconsin
 Mother Alphonse McCabe, Springfield Junior College, Springfield, Illinois
 Margaret E. Newman, Elgin Community College, Elgin, Illinois
 Mother Thomas Quigley, Springfield Junior College, Springfield, Illinois
 Mayne M. Rigotti, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee
 Sister Mary Thomas, O. P., Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart, Madison, Wisconsin

National Entrance Tests and Minimum Standards

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 3

Early in the discussion it became apparent that a majority of the workshop members wished to discover what tests are now in use, what uses these tests are being put to, and whether these tests are an accurate measure of the skills and knowledge we wish to measure. For this reason the discussion was directed in such a way as to reveal current practices and, to some extent, evaluation of those practices.

A summary of the information gathered reveals that, among the twenty-two institutions reporting, the ACE Cooperative English Test is far the most widely used. Fourteen use Test A (Mechanics of Expression), ten use Test B (Effectiveness of Expression), and eleven use Test C (Reading Comprehension). Other tests used are: the ACE Psychological Test, the Barrett-Ryan, Iowa Silent Reading, Iowa Colleges English Placement, Ohio College Ability, and the Purdue Placement in English. Twelve reported a theme, or themes, as a part of the testing program, three employ at least one speech, and several colleges use locally prepared tests. The more common uses of test results are: for exemption from part or all of the freshman course, for assigning students to remedial or sub-freshman work, for special ability grouping, for sectioning within the regular course, for assignment to special or remedial reading, for counselling, and for measuring growth at the end of the course.

Four Areas of Discussion

The information thus assembled served, in the remaining workshop sessions, as a basis for discussion in four areas.

1. *The Concept of Minimum Essentials.* Here the consensus was that the

concept of individual differences tends to invalidate the older, more rigid concept of minimum essentials as restricted largely to mechanics and sentence structure. Today's emphasis upon helping each individual to attain his maximum power seems to demand more of the teacher of the freshman course in English than striving for correctness. See Recommendation No. 1.

2. *Types of Remedial Work.* Of the twenty-two colleges and universities reporting, it was revealed that thirteen maintain some kind of sub-freshman program, for which three give credit; the remaining nine schools give remedial or clinical work in one form or another, again three of these for credit. The members of the workshop agreed that the prevalence of objective testing and the relatively small amount of writing done in some high schools, as reported by high school graduates, are important factors in assignment of large numbers of college freshmen to remedial work. For a number of reasons no conclusion can be drawn about the critical point on local or national test norms below which students are so assigned, but it is clear that that point varies widely. The reported percentage of an entering freshman class assigned to such work varies from five (one college) to forty-five (one college), with five reporting a figure of about twenty percent and three reporting a percentage between twenty-six and thirty. The consensus seemed to be that in the future the need for more rather than less remedial work can be anticipated.

3. *Uniformity of Standards.* Discussion revealed little or no uniformity among the colleges represented in the use of test results. That this lack of uni-

formity in standards was a matter of concern to the group is revealed in one of the recommendations attached to this report.

4. *Adequacy of Present National Tests.* Here several points emerged from the discussion. Perhaps most significant was the question: Do existing tests accurately measure those elements in actual student performance in the area of the language arts which we wish to measure? A good deal of doubt was expressed about the efficacy of existing objective tests in measuring the quality of student writing. It was significant here that twelve of the twenty-two institutions reported the use of themes as an additional testing device. Here also there was some agreement that the national norms of the Cooperative English Test are perhaps now out of date. A good many felt the need for a national test which will isolate the student weak in English more effectively than present tests do. In spite of this, it was felt that present tests are more effective in isolating students at the two extremes of the scale than in determining the breaking point between the middle groups, as between A and B, or B and C, students. An informal poll revealed that, in the opinion of the members, present national tests are only moderately successful in measuring student achievement. Mr. Clarence Derrick, of the Educational Testing Service, reported that long-range plans are being made for a comprehensive battery of tests that could be used from grade four to the graduate school. In this battery there would be new and presumably better tests in the language arts. He also gave as his opinion that the best single predictor of success in English is a good aptitude test combining measures of verbal facility and reading comprehension. The efficiency of prediction, however, is increased when the aptitude score is supplemented by the

score from a well-conceived English achievement test. Most members seemed to be of the opinion that of the three Cooperative English Tests A, B, and C, the one on reading comprehension (Test C) is the most valid measuring-instrument in the language arts. The wide use of national tests and the expressed dissatisfaction with them were chief factors leading to the following recommendations.

Recommendations

1. That the concept of minimum essentials not be limited wholly to mechanics and sentence structure, but that it include the concept of an elementary ability to focus on an idea and to select and organize supporting material.
2. That in testing programs more emphasis be placed upon reading comprehension test results.
3. That the CCCC appoint a committee to work with testing agencies in order to develop reading and writing tests, objective or non-objective, that (a) are based upon a broader view of minimum essentials; (b) are more effective instruments for diagnosing individual needs and for providing reliable criteria for sectioning; and (c) are useful in helping us to achieve greater uniformity in our standards.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 3

- Chairman:** John C. Gerber, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
Co-Chairman: J. E. Congleton, University of Florida, Gainesville
Secretary: Maxwell Freeman, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee
Co-Secretary: Clarence Derrick, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey
 Sam S. Barkett, Central Missouri College, Warrensburg
 F. E. Bowman, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina
 William Card, Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Illinois
 L. W. Coolidge, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio

Marion F. Coulson, Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays
 Oreta Dawson, West Virginia University, Morgantown
 Willard O. Eddy, Colorado A. and M. College, Fort Collins
 S. T. Evans, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois
 L. P. Goggin, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
 E. Fern Green, State Teachers College, Moorehead, Minnesota
 Eugene F. Grewe, University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan

John V. Hagopian, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
 Frank C. Householder, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo
 Mary C. E. Lukas, St. Xavier College, Chicago, Illinois
 Wright Thomas, State University Teachers College at Cortland, Cortland, New York
 Eugene B. Vest, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 Grady C. Watkins, Central States College, Edmond, Oklahoma
 Lucile Willowby, Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana

Preparation of the Composition or Communication Teacher

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 4

The 1953 Workshop followed rather closely the questions raised by the 1952 Workshop, "Teacher Training for Courses in Composition/Communication." The following premises for the discussion were generally accepted: that there is a need for training the composition or communication teacher; that this training should be given on the graduate level within the department of English; and that although it would be desirable for instructors of such graduate courses as linguistics and history of the language to slant their courses toward effective preparation of the teacher of college composition or communication, practically it is necessary to have a graduate course with that single object in mind. The course, in the first instance, should be required of all new graduate assistants who are responsible for teaching sections in composition or communication. The discussion then centered on questions in Part IV of the report of last year's Workshop.¹

I. A. Should a graduate course designed to prepare teachers of college composition and communication aim to define and inculcate principles and standards? The workshop agreed that

the development of a practical philosophy of communication is desirable; that although there are several valid modes of approach, the teacher of composition ought to be aware of which one he is using so that he can avoid the sort of chaotic sequence so frequently found in college composition courses.

B. Should such a course supply knowledge of recent practices and current experiments in the teaching of composition and communication? By all means.

C. Should it train in skills of classroom teaching? There were several recommendations: (1) A mimeographed booklet distributed to the junior teaching staff could take care of such routine matters as getting the course started; (2) A recording might be taken of a class meeting and then discussed in an interview between the student teacher and the director of the composition program; (3) A "big brother" program might be arranged between permanent staff members and student teachers so that each student teacher could have an experienced mentor.

II. What status and emphasis, if any, should be given in graduate instruction to this course? The workshop agreed that the course should receive graduate credit and that therefore the course should cover theory in such fields as

¹See "Teacher Training for Courses in Composition/Communication," *College Composition and Communication*, III (December, 1952), 41.

rhetoric and other areas within the province of communication. The course should be required of all candidates for the master's degree in English; there should be no separation in the graduate programs for teachers and research scholars.

III. Should certain traditional courses be modified or oriented toward such training? The discussion revealed that the orientation of existing graduate courses in such fields as linguistics and history of the language is desirable but perhaps unfeasible so long as senior staff members remain uninterested in the problems of teaching composition and communication.

IV. Should there be any modification of the Ph.D. thesis in connection

with such training (*i.e.*, to allow studies investigating problems in the teaching of composition and communication)? Yes.

V. If part of the graduate program, should graduate courses in the theory of composition and communication orient students to the profession as well? Perhaps.

The 1953 Workshop recommended that next year's workshop center its discussion around questions 7, 8, and 9, Part IV, of the report submitted by the 1952 Workshop.² It was also recommended that existing graduate courses aimed at preparing the teacher of college composition and communication, such as those of Philip R. Wikelund at Indiana University and Albert Kitzhaber at the University of Kansas, be discussed in detail.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 4

Chairman:³ Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Secretary: Keith Rinehart, The Stout Institute, Menomonie, Wisconsin

Co-Secretary: J. Hooper Wise, University of Florida, Gainesville

Sister Mary Amarella, St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Indiana

J. D. Bailey, University of Illinois, Urbana
Ellsworth Barnard, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Sister M. Basilla, De Lourdes Institute, Des Plaines, Illinois

Richard Beal, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

Sister Beatrice, College of St. Francis, Joliet, Illinois

Cecil A. Blue, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri

Wayne C. Booth, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania

Francis Bowman, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

Howard A. Burton, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Francis Christensen, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Mildred F. Cross, Arkansas Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff

Ella Dute, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois

Karl W. Dykema, Youngstown College, Youngstown, Ohio

Leo Goggin, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls

Sister M. Gregory, De Lourdes Institute, Des Plaines, Illinois

Herbert Hackett, Michigan State College, East Lansing

Maurice A. Hatch, University of Kentucky, Lexington

Harrison Hayford, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Lee S. Hultzen, University of Illinois, Urbana

Albert R. Kitzhaber, University of Kansas, Lawrence

Strang Lawson, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York

Robert M. Limpus, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo

Jean Malmstrom, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo

Barriss Mills, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Tess Morgan, Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa

Robert Ogle, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Carrie M. Stanley, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Sigrid Stark, Purdue University Extension, Hammond, Indiana

James B. Steele, Nebraska State Teachers College, Peru

Harriet Sweetland, University of Wisconsin Extension, Milwaukee

Nila Turner, Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas

William S. Wight, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida

Philip R. Wikelund, Indiana University, Bloomington

²Ibid.

³Lennox Grey, Teachers College, Columbia University, originally scheduled as chairman of this workshop, was unable to attend the convention.

Sub-Freshman Composition—The Poorly-Equipped Student

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 5

Voting upon a list of possible subjects supplied by the chairman, members of the workshop decided to discuss: motivation of students in sub-freshman courses; course content; screening procedures used to determine what students should be required to take sub-freshman English; teaching devices; teaching procedures.

The following suggestions were discussed as partial solutions to motivation problems: (1) exposition of the instructor's own friendly attitude during the introductory sessions of the course; (2) elimination of any suggestion that the student is being penalized by being placed in the sub-freshman course; (3) stress on individual attention to the needs of the student; (4) emphasis on the student's realization of his own needs and deficiencies; (5) utilization of the first few class hours for solving morale problems rather than presenting formal course content; (6) utilization of cooperative attitudes on the part of other academic departments; (7) whole or partial credit for the course; (8) stress on the integration of sub-freshman English with other phases of his general college program; (9) systems whereby better students could be remanded out of sub-freshman courses.

The next general subject under consideration was course content. Specific suggestions on this subject varied widely: (1) use of newspapers and magazines as materials for teaching; (2) use of books containing simpler reading materials; (3) simple assignments in speaking; (4) compulsory conferences, especially to obviate the need for some handbook drill and to integrate the sub-freshman English work with the rest of the student's program; (5) requiring students to keep files marking their prog-

ress; (6) insistence on the students' correcting their own errors, after having been given grammatical instruction; (7) use of workbook drills only for those students whose need for particular drills is indicated by repetition of certain errors; (8) assignment of as much writing as possible; (9) examination of the student's own usage, which may reveal a concentration of errors in only a very limited area, and the preparation in each college of a list of words frequently misspelled there, since general lists may be misleading; (10) preliminary instruction in syllabification and pronunciation; (11) treatment of problems of grammar and punctuation only when they arise, rather than according to the demands of a set course schedule; (12) early treatment of some very basic grammar, perhaps "functional," especially in view of the limited time assigned to the subject. The group made no formal indication of its feelings on the relative values of the suggestions listed above.

The group then dealt with the question of the main subject matter of sub-freshman courses. It was said that reading ability was sometimes neglected and that reading should be taught. Speaking was recommended also, partly because of its value to students in relation to the whole of their college work. The importance of writing was strongly mentioned, with arguments that as much writing as possible should be assigned and that students could learn writing only by writing. Eventually the group agreed that writing was the most important part of the sub-freshman program.

The following screening procedures for determining which students should take sub-freshman English were discussed, without an expression of majority feeling: use of impromptu themes;

tests like the ACE; the Nelson-Denny and other reading tests; consideration of high-school grades; precis-writing exercises; individual counseling of students; objective tests alone. It was indicated that many colleges had systems for remanding students back and forth from sub-freshman English to the regular courses, that various colleges gave placement exams well in advance of the registration period, that standards in placement examinations were often set arbitrarily or through budgetary considerations. A list of various placement examinations was compiled.

The following is a list of the most important observations on practices generally agreed upon during the final session of Workshop No. 5: (1) the percentage of students in the sub-freshman work varied from college to college from as low as five percent to as high as thirty-three percent; (2) classes should be held to not more than twenty students, although instruction of large groups was better than nothing at all; (3) the value of workbook drills was doubted; (4) it was best to have a single instructor handle a group rather than several instructors in rotation; (5) separating the sub-freshman group from the others and giving them special instruction was the more common procedure; (6) the general practice was to charge students for

the course, although some colleges did not do so; (7) writing correctness and effectiveness were the chief criteria in judging whether or not students passed the course; (8) considerations of mechanical sentence unity were of paramount importance in sub-freshman English (*i.e.*, period fault, comma fault, etc.); (9) there were differences in procedure in giving or withholding academic credit for the course, about three quarters of the colleges represented preferring the latter procedure; (10) in general a different text was used for sub-freshman English than that for the regular freshman course; (11) the student who had passed sub-freshman English but who subsequently relapsed into poor composition habits constituted a problem; perhaps a general re-examination and a remanding process general throughout the college, in which other departments assisted, would help; (12) there was a high correlation between the personnel of students in sub-freshman courses and those whose names appeared on probation lists; (13) there is uncertainty about the time at which students should take the sub-freshman course, that is, in which semester of the college careers.

The group came to few conclusions. The over-all conclusion suggested is that the sub-freshman English student has been and will remain a problem for us.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 5

Chairman: William A. Sutton, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

Co-Chairman: Edith Layer, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Secretary: Donald W. Lee, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Co-Secretary: H. A. Wycherley, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland

P. W. Barrus, East Texas State Teachers College, Commerce

Ralph D. Behrens, Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway

Harry M. Brown, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

James W. Byrd, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville

Meta Riley Emberger, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

Nellie F. Falk, Dana College, Blair, Nebraska

Howard Finley, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois

Marvin Fisher, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan

Richard B. Geyer, University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa

Dora M. Golden, Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio

Sister Gonzaga, St. Mary College, Xavier, Kansas

- Maxine Gordon, Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Illinois
 Lois Henderson, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa
 Kenneth Hoag, University of Idaho, Moscow
 John C. Hodges, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Agnes Horness, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois
 Aria D. Hunter, La Junta Junior College, La Junta, Colorado
 Adelaide Jones, Drury College, Springfield, Missouri
 Alex J. Katauskas, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois
 Virginia M. Kivits, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Robert L. Lasley, Morris Harvey College, West Virginia
 Glenn Leggett, University of Washington, Seattle
 David H. Malone, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn
 Mrs. Cleo S. McCray, Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, Florida
 Ernestine A. Neff, Roosevelt College, Chicago, Illinois
 Herbert B. Nelson, Oregon State College, Corvallis
 Margaret M. Neville, De Paul University, Chicago, Illinois
 T. J. Phillips, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
 Kathryn Quintan, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 Pauline Rosaire, Herzl Junior College, Chicago, Illinois
 Selona Smith, Texas College, Tyler
 William D. Spring, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Paul R. Sullivan, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
 Josephine B. Suriano, Washington Square College, New York University, New York City
 Gladys Taylor, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois
 Beatrice S. Timmis, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 Helen Todd, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois
 Waters Turpin, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland
 Philip R. Wikelund, Indiana University, Bloomington
 Howard Wilcox, Wright Junior College, Chicago
 Maurita Willett, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 Jamye Williams, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio
 Henry L. Wilson, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Super - Freshman Composition—The Well-Equipped Student

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 6

Five areas were discussed: (1) a definition of the super-freshman, (2) pre-testing, (3) objectives of a special course, (4) the materials of the course, and (5) techniques of teaching the super-freshman.

1. Definition

The super-freshman should be capable in all areas: mechanics, reading comprehension, style, usage. He should have scored well on a psychological test. This does not exclude the very bright student who may have been poorly trained in secondary school. If he can and does motivate himself, he may well be allowed into the superior course. One panel member felt that superior freshmen should be superior in the quality of their work only; they should not be expected to do more work quantitatively. Perhaps the whole problem of definition is a relative one. The better students in any given

school are arbitrarily placed in a super-freshman section. No panel member indicated that there was such a thing as an absolute objective norm that could be used from year to year.

Certain measuring sticks were proposed. An inquiry into the student's favorite subject, his extracurricular objective, and his own analysis of himself might be some means of recognizing the superior freshman. It would be well, perhaps, to encourage administrators to put such categories on the admission applications for the use of the English department. This leads into the next area of discussion:

2. Pre-Testing

It is necessary for the sake of administration and economy to pre-test the freshman in order to discover the super-freshman before the school semester begins. The material gleaned from the

measuring sticks mentioned above can be helpful in sectioning students. Almost all members of the panel agreed that an impromptu theme written in the traditional freshman week, or in the first week of school, was also necessary no matter what kind of pre-testing program was used. Some schools, however, still use *only* an objective test in determining student placement. The ACE, the College Board, and others of that kind were mentioned. Perhaps a combination of the two provides the answer. The objective score of the student can then be measured against an example of his performance. Of the participating panel members, nine used the objective test only, ten used a combination of tests, and one used the essay alone. Certain other factors figure in a pretesting program. The student's high school rank, his grade in high school English, his I.Q. score, and a statement by the secondary school principal may be used to advantage, though always with caution. Whatever data available from the student's secondary school record, plus the data obtained by the college testing program, plus a sample of his written work, may provide a workable, though not infallible, sectioning program.

3. Objectives of a Special Course

Any freshman course in English should be regarded as at least partially a skill course, no matter what level of student it may be concerned with. To this can be added the teaching of thinking and reading. But the delicate relationship that exists between writing, thinking, and reading cannot be fully explored. It is probably best to recognize it *de facto*, and concentrate on the writing process. Some programs recognize the super-freshman course as a skill course only. Thus, when a student reaches a certain score, he is exempt from one or both semesters of freshman English. In some

cases, this would have been the last required English course. Such a program reduces the number of aggregate hours a student takes in English. The workshop, on the whole, seemed to feel that this was a dangerous tendency. Most of the workshop members concluded that the objectives of the super-freshman course should be constructed in the light of the needs of the super-freshman student. If he has mastered the minimum essentials, the objectives of the course should be to take him beyond the minimum essentials. If he has little need for the study of grammar, then such study should be eliminated. The objectives of the course could then be based, for example, upon a sensitivity to ideas in reading that is already present in the super-freshman.

4. The Materials of the Course

Some panel members indicated that no set texts were used. The materials were drawn largely from students' writing and interests. One member described the use of a parliamentary law session for each classroom meeting. Most of the panel members used required texts; these, however, generally differed from those used by average sections. Some of the texts mentioned were Brooks and Warren, *Modern Rhetoric*; Thompson and Hicks, *Thought and Experience in Prose*; McNamee, *Reading for Understanding*. Many panel members used supplementary texts: Thoreau's *Walden*, the *Iliad*, and the *Odyssey*, to mention a few.

It was refreshing to note that the emphasis in the super-freshman sections was not on the materials of the course, but on the resources of the student, the attitude and methods of the teacher.

5. Techniques of Teaching

Many suggestions were made. The teacher experiences the super-freshman in one of two situations: (a) when the college does not have a sectioning pro-

gram the superior student finds himself in a heterogeneous group, (b) when the college does section students into ability groups.

What can be done for the super-freshman when he is in mixed company? The danger is boredom and lack of interest. Briefly, he deserves special attention, which can be given to him in many ways. The traditional conference, some felt, was still the most effective method of appealing to and exercising the interests of the superior student. He may be asked to work on school publications as an outlet for his greater talent and energy. A reading program supervised by the teacher, the technique of allowing him to help the instructor teach by his performance, an extra credit program for outside reading—these were some ways suggested for providing for his extra talent.

What can be done for the super-freshman when he is in a super-freshman group? Various college programs were

described for the members of the workshop. A greater amount of material, as well as greater speed and more effective writing, characterized the usual super-freshman program. While most workshop members felt that the writing of the traditional forms of discourse (especially exposition) was the function of the student in the course, some members felt that an introduction to literature and literary criticism was a proper object of the course. The study of the forms of literature was the basis of one course. Some discussion evolved as to the difference between this course and the traditional sophomore literature course. Most workshop members agreed that the super-freshman should write the traditional research paper, but he should use some primary sources if possible. The class limitation suggested for such sections in order to make techniques worth-while was about twenty students. This cannot be regarded as a hopeless ideal.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 6

Chairman: John Weimer, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Co-Chairman: Ruth Davies, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio

Secretary: Russell K. Alspach, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York

Co-Secretary: Joseph Schwartz, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Rev. James G. Alexander, S. C. J., Sacred Heart Monastery, Hales Corners, Wisconsin

Gleah Brown, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago

W. L. Garner, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Bertha M. Johnston, University of North Dakota

Sister Mary Austin La Forest, Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan

Sister Mary Ernestine, S. C. L., St. Mary College, Xavier, Kansas

Sister Mary Inez Hanley, Mercy College, Detroit

Sister Miriam Joseph, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana

Robert Nossen, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska

Anne Pederson, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Walter G. Prouswitz, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota

Leonard W. Rice, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

Francis Roellinger, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio

Gerald E. Silveira, Alabama College, Montevallo

George D. Stout, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

Viola M. Thiel, Dana College, Blair, Nebraska

Elizabeth D. Van Schaack, Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas

Esther Webb, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant

Thomas H. Wetmore, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

Joseph Wolff, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois

James A. Work, Indiana University, Bloomington

Use of Community Resources in Teaching Freshman English

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 7

Workshop No. 7 took Irving Lee seriously.¹ We moved immediately to consideration of "cases" exemplifying the use of community resources in the teaching of composition and communication. A quick overview of the kinds of cases directed by members of the workshop—folklore studies, application of Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*, linguistic exploration of community language habits, studies of urban-rural relations, orientation to a college campus as a new community demanding varied kinds of language use, and investigation of communication patterns in communities experiencing intergroup tensions—moved us first to think of definitions of "community" as widening local perimeters to regional, national, and world community. In terms of course organization, we recognized the possibility of starting from the global and working into the local scene, or of starting with the immediate observable, familiar scene and reaching out for applications on a regional-world scale.

Key "case" for the world-to-local pattern came from the Wisconsin State College at River Falls where a freshman project, taking its cues from the disciplines of anthropology, opens with reading and discussion of Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*, which introduces students to concepts of relativity and symbolic representation of cultural values. The project continues, as the workshop heard, with comparison of Thornton Wilder's *Our Town* in two mediums, print and film. From this specific case

(in Lee's sense) the freshmen move to examination of their own communities, which are largely rural centers within a radius of sixty miles of the college. Reporting on their assessments of community life in their home towns takes three forms—a visual symbolization in a college,² a written evaluation, and an oral report of ideas and values explored in both other forms. Additional writing experience comes in a kind of role-playing activity in which students, using their new knowledge of varied language habits, write (as Lardner in *Haircut*) essays, stories, plays, and letters which project character, personality, and social status through language.

As the workshop discussed this particular use of community resources, it seemed to the members that a number of significant values could accrue from comparable projects: practice in the communication skills of reading, writing, speaking, listening, observing, and demonstrating—plus a seventh one of reading aloud; dependence on personal observation and independent research for value judgments rather than on condensations and paraphrasing characteristic of many assigned research papers; extension of class activities into community life to establish realization that English isn't over when the bell rings.

Key case for the local-to-world pattern of study came from the New York State University Teachers College at Cortland, New York. Here the central disciplines stem from the linguistics of Bloomfield, Sapir, and Fries, with generous borrowing from sociology, psychology, and mass media research. The class, designated for prospective teachers, starts by observing the variety of its own language habits—levels of usage, local and regional dialects, vocational vocabularies, mass

¹Irving Lee of Northwestern University gave the opening keynote address of the 1953 CCCC Spring Meeting, "Design for Talking Together." It will be published in the December issue of *College Composition and Communication*.

²Walter J. Engler, "'Our Town' for Communication Classes," *College English*, Vol. 14, No. 3, December 1952, pp. 150-156.

media influences, etc. With this concept of the "speech community" in mind, class groups move out with tape recorders to local service club meetings, stores, bus terminals, and the like, to record for later study the language habits of all strata of local society. Oral reports and written summaries clinch these observations and interviewing practices.

In this procedure the workshop again saw value in dependence on personal observation of live language situations to increase awareness of the significance of language in human affairs.

Between these two progressions, world-local and local-world, the workshop shared additional cases in which community resources were utilized in reading, collecting, and writing up of local-regional folklore (in New York,

South Dakota, Alabama); in examination of intergroup tensions through use of the Lasswell "formula" of Who . . . says What . . . to Whom . . . through What medium . . . with What effect? Beyond these community resources several members reported a new kind of resource for the study of language in the form of students in the campus community who do not speak English as a native language—visiting fellows and children of displaced families.

For workshop members, all these cases pointed toward the use of the community as "a language laboratory" where students can apply scientific techniques of investigation and personally discover the kinds of inter-relationships stressed in contemporary studies in anthropology, communications, ecology, linguistics and semantics.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 7

Chairman: Francis Shoemaker, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Co-Chairman: William Hoth, State University of New York, Teachers College, Cortland

Secretary: Francis Chisholm, Wisconsin State College, River Falls

Co-Secretary: Earl Hutchinson, Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh

Richard Cassell, Dakota Wesleyan College, Mitchell, South Dakota

Wahnita DeLong, Evansville College, Evansville, Indiana

Meta R. Emberger, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

Ruth Furniss, Louisville Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky

Jesse W. Harris, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale

Mary M. Hussey, University of Illinois, Urbana

Donald Meyer, Lake Geneva Public Schools, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin

Dorothy Overley, University of Kentucky, Northern Center, Covington

Peter Veltman, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

Status in the Profession of the Composition Teacher

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 8

Because the CCCC's Executive Committee has already appointed a committee to bring in recommendations on a national survey of composition/communication and the status of the composition/communication teacher, Workshop No. 8 tried to channel its discussions somewhat more than the usual workshop wished to do.

The group discussed the importance of

the subject. There was agreement, as one might expect, that status is perfectly satisfactory in some schools, especially in those technical institutions where most of the English that is taught is composition. In such schools the composition instructor has no problems of status different from those of faculty members in other departments; promotions, for instance, come as readily to him as to any-

one else. The workshop recognized, however, that a rather small number of persons are teachers of composition exclusively.

At many schools people find themselves discouraged from working in composition (1) because they see promotions and salary increases reserved as rewards for work in literature, especially for research; (2) because they lack previous training in composition in graduate schools, where the attitude often is that composition teaching is an apprenticeship to be lived through before escape into literature; (3) because they regard composition teaching as a mere proof-reading job that they themselves lack respect for; (4) because their teaching loads are likely to be heavier in the period of their careers in which they teach composition; and (5) because respect in a scholarly community goes mainly to those engaged in literary research.

There is of course a large variety of attitudes toward composition and the composition teacher. At one large university in the Middle West composition is taught by a corps of graduate students; no one above the rank of instructor teaches freshman composition. (This is the institution where during the emergency of World War II an assistant professor objected to being put back even temporarily to "play in the sandpile of rhetoric.") In contrast to this is the situation at many small and medium-sized schools where everyone in the department teaches some composition and often the best instructors are assigned to composition because it is so highly valued.

The workshop believes (1) that graduate programs (both for the master's and doctor's degrees) should provide specific training for composition teaching and should encourage students to prepare themselves to teach composition as well as literature; graduate schools might

make these improvements not only by adding new courses in composition teaching but by emphasizing the principles of composition in works taught in existing courses in literature; (2) that the composition teacher should be recognized as one of the chief agents in liberating the undergraduate's ability to express his ideas; (3) that instructors should be encouraged to write (in many fields, whether fiction or non-fiction, prose or poetry) and to investigate problems in composition teaching, and that such work should be regarded as highly as literary research and, for purposes of promotion, should be considered as equivalent in worth; (4) that all members of a department, regardless of rank, should teach composition at least occasionally; and (5) that a person who wants to concentrate primarily in composition and make teaching it his career should be given equal opportunity with others to rise in salary and rank.

In spite of the low regard in which composition teaching is often held, the workshop felt that there are some ways—however limited—in which writing is gaining in prestige. Industries, for instance, sometimes find use for composition teachers and pay good salaries to get them. (Industry indeed prefers training in composition to training in literature.) Status is also raised by organizations and their meetings and publications; the meetings of CCCC and the publication of its *Bulletin* are probably the best examples of this improvement in status.

The group took up some of the problems connected with conducting a national survey such as the one being considered by the CCCC Executive Committee. A number of detailed suggestions were made to the committee which is preparing recommendations for the CCCC Executive Committee. For instance, it was pointed out that in a sur-

vey of the status of the composition teacher at any given school, questionnaires to instructors, to the departmental chairman, and to the administration would need to be different.

The workshop concluded by recommending to the CCCC the carrying on

of a national survey. When completed and when its results were published, such a survey would be a source of information on the present state of composition and the composition teacher that would be valuable both to schools and to individuals.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 8

Chairman: Irwin Griggs, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Co-Chairman: William Beauchamp, State Teachers College, Geneseo, New York

Secretary: Henry W. Sams, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Co-Secretary: Kellogg Hunt, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Charles Adams, University of Illinois, Urbana
Jerome W. Archer, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Harry Crosby, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

J. V. Cunningham, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Ella Dute, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois

John G. Gerriettes, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois

T. J. Kallsen, West Virginia University, Morgantown

Margaret M. Neville, De Paul University, Chicago, Illinois

Grady G. Stubbs, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan

Lucille Turner, East Carolina College, Greenville, North Carolina

Richard A. Wells, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Improving Reading Ability

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 9

Discussion centered on two approaches to the teaching of reading: (1) through group classroom instruction and (2) through more individualized clinical and laboratory procedures.

In some colleges and universities the training in reading is part of a broad study-skills course, in others part of the freshman English or Communications sequence, and in still others a separate reading-skills course. Similar differences were found with respect to the required or elective or the credit or non-credit nature of the training. It was encouraging to note how many institutions are now offering credit for training in reading, and showing increased concern over the *developmental needs* of the average and superior student.

The integrating of training in reading with other content material follows no set pattern. It is sometimes integrated

with the teaching of organizational forms, deductive, inductive, or time or space arrangements. This combination is designed to take advantage of the relationships among the various communication skills, each tending to reinforce learning in the other skills areas, and is particularly appropriate when the training in reading is part of the general training in English or Communication.

Mention was also made of specific classroom techniques for improving reading rate and comprehension, for enlarging interests, and for motivating student work. Discussion questions requiring the student to note details, get main ideas, draw inferences, and reach conclusions help students appreciate the complex nature of the reading process. Harvard films, reading accelerators, and daily rate and comprehension checks were spoken of as useful motivational devices. The

group seemed in agreement as to the importance of helping the student apply his newly developed skills in a practical way to the requirements of other courses, emphasis on a definite pattern of attack being particularly helpful.

In some schools the clinic or laboratory provides the only available training, students being either required or urged to attend. Elsewhere that training is provided as a supplementary service to all students who wish to take advantage of it.

At Bowling Green State University clinical procedures are worked out in detail. A difference of thirty points between the quantitative and linguistic score on the American Council on Education *Psychological Examination* is used as the basis for referring a student to the clinic. The student is then given preliminary interviews, fills out questionnaires, takes inventories, and is given silent reading tests. His problems are then analyzed on the basis of these data, consultations with the psychological, speech, and hearing clinics being also available. He may then

be sent to a two-hour credit course where he writes his own reading history, works out a time budget, and learns to use various reading skills. Every two weeks students share reading experiences in class discussions.

The following reading materials were mentioned:

Tests: *Brown-Carlsen Listening Comprehension Test* (World Book Company), *Cooperative Reading Test* (Educational Testing Service), *Diagnostic Reading Tests* (Committee on Diagnostic Reading Tests), *Iowa Silent Reading Test* (World Book Company).

Manuals: Baker, *Reading Skills* (Prentice-Hall), Brown, *Efficient Reading* (D. C. Heath), Rosenthal, Hummell, and Leichy, *Effective Reading* (Houghton Mifflin), Simpson, SRA Better Reading Books (Science Research Associates), Strang, *Study Types of Reading Exercises, College Level* (Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia), and Stroud and Ammons, *Improving Reading Ability* (Appleton-Century-Crofts).

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 9

Chairman: James I. Brown, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Co-Chairman: Dorothy Moulton, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

Secretary: William D. Baker, Michigan State College, East Lansing

Co-Secretary: Leone Burfield, Reading Clinic, University of Chicago, Chicago

P. J. Aldus, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin

Sister Mary Aquin, S. S. J., Nazareth College, Nazareth, Michigan

Paul F. Bente, Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Lou Ella Burmeister, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee

Gertrude Callahan, The Stout Institute, Menomonie, Wisconsin

A. T. Clark, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

Catherine Cunningham, Marshall High School, Chicago, Illinois

Vila Deubach, Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana

James Downer, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Richard M. Eastman, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois

Natalie Finder, Herzl Junior College, Chicago, Illinois

Marvin Fisher, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan

Roger Forseth, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Rexie I. Gill, Roosevelt College, Chicago, Illinois

Maxine Gordon, Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Illinois

John A. Heide, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater

Kenneth Hoag, University of Idaho, Moscow

Ernest W. Kinne, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana

Myrtle C. Koranda, Marshall High School, Chicago, Illinois

Mabel Lacey, Fort Hays State College, Hays, Kansas

Sister M. Lenore, St. Joseph High School, Kalamazoo, Michigan

Nell Lanham Leonian, University of West Virginia, Morgantown

Ralph Loomis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

- Marian McAnally, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois
 Helen Needham, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois
 Alan Nelson, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
 Hugh Nugent, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Estelle V. Palonis, Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Illinois
 Dorees C. Parshall, Lyons Township Jr. College, La Grange, Illinois
 Jean Protheroe, Carthage College, Carthage, Illinois
 James E. Robinson, University of Illinois, Urbana
 F. X. Roellinger, Jr., Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio
 J. Carter Rowland, Gannon College, Erie, Pa.
 Nannie May Roney, Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas
 William Rosenthal, University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch, Duluth
- Janet Ross, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
 Florence Sachs, University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, Milwaukee
 Lewis C. Smith, Jr., St. Cloud State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
 Sister Maris Stella, Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan
 Paul R. Sullivan, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
 Cynthia C. Supples, Carver High School, Chicago 27, Illinois
 Ailene B. Thompson, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
 Kermit Vanderbilt, Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa
 Louis R. Ward, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
 Frederic R. White, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin
 O. S. Williams, Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Illinois

The ABC's of the Combination of Written and Oral Communication

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 10

Workshop Number 10, assigned to discuss the ABC's of written and oral communication, decided to begin by phrasing the topic in the form of a question: What should be combined in a communications course? This led various members of the workshop to give informative descriptions of what *is* combined in their particular schools, rather than to a discussion of what *should be* combined. Fairly complete, but general, descriptions of the programs at Grinnell College, Stephens College, George Peabody College for Teachers, La Crosse State College, and Olivet Nazarene College were presented.

After the descriptions, the group wanted to rephrase the question. This time to: What *can be* combined? Here some agreement was reached on the following points with the advantages to each skill, resulting from the combination, being pointed out:

1. Techniques of transitions
2. Diction
3. Organization of ideas

4. Content
5. General communicativeness (especially in writing)
6. Selecting a purpose or central idea

Next it seemed logical to consider: What types of assignments serve best to teach these skills in combination? The group agreed that the following were valuable in varying degrees:

1. Written and spoken evaluations of articles and speeches of argument and persuasion.
2. Original persuasive writing and speaking.
3. Group Discussions of almost anything—current problems, literature, research projects, etc.
4. Written and spoken descriptions of processes and giving directions.
5. Written and oral reports—both objective and slanted.
6. The research project with accompanying oral reports.
7. Analysis of newspapers and magazines—written and oral.

Though it was not the primary purpose of this particular workshop, the group wanted next to consider the question: Can persons trained in one discipline successfully teach the combined course? The group agreed "yes": if the objectives of the course were kept at the ABC level in both disciplines, if the teacher were secure in at least one area (though cases of the inexperienced were cited as doing the best teaching), and

if the teacher had a "correct attitude" toward the course.

All in all, the members of Workshop Number 10, for the most part, exchanged ideas about what has been and is being done in communication courses at various institutions. Their approach throughout the discussions was practical rather than theoretical, and they were eager to get new ideas to test in their efforts to find out what the ABC's should be.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 10

Chairman: Curtis Bradford, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa

Co-Chairman: Freida Johnson, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

Secretary: Hazel Moritz Scott, Indiana University, Bloomington

Co-Secretary: Donald Bird, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

Dorothy Anderson, University of Colorado, Boulder

Thelma Anton, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

Agnes Boner, Montana State University, Missoula

Blanche Bowman, Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Illinois

Le Roy C. Brown, Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Illinois

Louis Hasley, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

Adelaide Jones, Drury College, Springfield, Missouri

Eugene La Vine, Austin Junior College, Austin, Minnesota

F. D. Lemke, Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio

Thomas G. Meara, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Donald H. Minnick, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois

Stanley Paulson, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

David G. Pugh, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Robert Roth, Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Illinois

Velma Ruch, Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa

Helen Sellers, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

Marjorie Spain, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois

Ben Strandness, Michigan State College, East Lansing

Margaret Trautwein, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

C. E. Wilkinson, Peru State Teachers College, Peru, Nebraska

Edith Wing, Wisconsin State College, La Crosse

Writing for Business and Industry

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 11

The group approached its topic by gathering a list of the kinds of jobs that technical students might be expected to hold, and the kinds of writing demanded by each job. This list soon included some fifteen categories, the types of writing ranging from letters of application to editorial assignments. Very quickly it began to be evident that the group considered the "psychology of the writing situation" as a factor in communication more essential, for purposes of the work-

shop, than the mechanics of analysis, style, or organization.

On this basis, some principles of teaching in English classes began to emerge for discussion. They were these:

1. Insistence on an acceptable level of usage and the fundamentals of sentence-structure and current idiom
2. Knowledge of the elements of good writing, such as economy,

completeness, accuracy, appropriateness, and clarity

3. Understanding of the "reader" and consideration of him in every kind of writing
4. The use of models of both bad and good writing, in order to make a writing task specific and definite
5. Experiment with writing clinics and case history techniques directed towards special writing tasks
6. Close cooperation between the English staff and the technical staffs in handling writing assignments
7. The use of non-technical and creative materials in technical writing courses

As these principles were formulated, most of the members of the group gave instances of problems and solutions from their own experience. Extreme positions on these principles either no longer exist, or simply were not represented in this workshop. Divergence of opinion often boiled down to whether only the freshman course in composition were available at a particular school. Where only one course was given, the representatives of the liberal arts colleges argued strongly for the goal of self-understanding by the student. In this process of understanding, works of creative literature seemed to form a necessary part of the reading. Representatives from technical schools accepted this goal as desirable, but felt that even in a general course there could be some recognition of immediately utilitarian goals in writing.

It was pointed out that any business or industry which wanted forms or styles of writing used peculiar to itself should expect to set up its own in-plant

training program. Even in specialized letter and report writing courses, it was believed that schools should place emphasis on general principles of good composition, supplemented by consideration of the use to which a particular piece of writing would be put.

There was general feeling that the English departments had the prime responsibility for courses in writing. Even as the writing specialist was coming into his own, it was agreed that basic principles of good writing do exist and must be taught to all students.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 11

Chairman: R. E. Tuttle, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan
Secretary: A. M. Buchan, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
Co-Secretary: F. E. Ryerson, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky
 Florence C. Ballenger, Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Illinois
 Margaret D. Bickle, Ohio State University, Columbus
 William M. Burke, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana
 Howard Burton, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
 Mary Busswell, West Virginia University, Morgantown
 Giles A. Daeger, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Elsie Fletcher, Elgin Community College, Elgin, Illinois
 Charlotte Gould, Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa
 Alma B. Hovey, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
 Joseph J. Irwin, Albion College, Albion, Michigan
 Ross Jewell, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
 Charles Kaplan, Roosevelt College, Chicago, Illinois
 Thomas Kishler, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Joseph Marshall, University of South Dakota, Vermillion
 George McMichael, Sears, Roebuck and Co., Chicago, Illinois
 Richard Snyder, Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio
 Captain Joe F. Tarpey, U. S. Air Force, Maxwell AFB, Alabama
 Richard Wells, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
 Charles F. Wheeler, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio
 Mentor L. Williams, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago
 Mary E. Wimer, Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne

Integration of High School and College Teaching of Composition

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 12

Workshop 12, Integration of High School and College Teaching of Composition, was composed of representatives of seventeen high schools, twenty-one colleges and universities, one academy, one publishing firm, and one professional journal. With such varied backgrounds, the participants brought to the conference table many ideas about what should be taught by English teachers in high schools and colleges and about the importance of integrating this teaching.

Following the procedure established in other years, the workshop first reviewed the conclusions of the workshops in 1950, 1951, and 1952. (Records of these workshops are to be found in the respective issues of *College Composition and Communication*.) Then the participants propounded questions and topics for discussion at the three sessions they would attend.

When the discussion began, the workshop sought to clarify the function of the English teacher in high school. Should the high school aim at preparing the student for college English? Should the high school teacher seek out what the college teacher wants taught and then teach it? The workshop said "no" to both questions and expressed the conviction that teachers of English in high school, like teachers of English at all levels, have a job of their own to do—to teach English as a humanity and as a skill. The members of the workshop agreed that the high school teacher would do well to center attention upon the students before them and not keep an eye on what he thinks is wanted by the college teacher of composition. The conclusion was that the best interests of the whole profession would be served if teachers in high school would abandon once for all any notion that their job is

primarily to prepare students for college composition and if teachers in college would abandon once for all any similar notion that they might hold about the function of high school teaching. Obviously, all teachers of composition in all schools are working toward the same ends.

With that position established, the workshop went on to other questions.

Question 1: Are there physical interferences with the teaching of English in high schools and colleges? The participants agreed that there are, the most important one being the high teaching loads, especially in high schools. Integration programs over the nation might help alleviate conditions by discussing conditions and passing resolutions about them.

Question 2: Is there agreement among the teachers in high school and college as to what constitutes the matter to be taught? Assuming that teachers of composition at both levels agree that one aim is the improvement of student writing, the workshop wondered whether language exercises might be crowding out of composition courses the actual writing of papers. There seemed to be agreement that language study is a means toward the improvement of writing and not an end in itself; that language exercises should not be a substitute for writing; that teachers in high school would help their own ends by requiring more writing of both planned and impromptu papers.

There seemed to be fairly complete concurrence that matters of terminology will be approached slowly at both high school and college levels. Detailed study of grammatical terminology will be eliminated, but basic identifications (subject and predicate elements, etc.) will be

taught with other items being introduced and studied slowly if at all. (Reference was made at this point to R. C. Pooley's "Forever Grammar," *Bulletin of Secondary School Principals*, February, 1946.) The approach to writing, outlined above, plus this approach to grammatical study should help the student to write so clearly that he can be understood and received—in other words, he will have "communicated." If he has "communicated" to his audience and readers, he has used that English which is "good" and not "bad."

Question 3: What point of view should the teachers at the two levels take toward language study? Much time was devoted to this question, appearing as it did in each of the sessions. The consensus was that the teacher of composition would do well to adopt what has been called the scientific or realistic point of view as opposed to the conventional point of view; that the teaching of grammar and mechanics should be descriptive rather than prescriptive. In these discussions frequent reference was made to such writers on language as Fries, Perrin, Summey, Marckwardt, Pooley, and Jespersen and to *The English Language Arts*. The workshop believed that other integration projects might well recommend this liberal point of view toward language study as a means of bringing into coherence the teaching of composition in high schools and colleges.

Question 4: What qualities in student writing should be most valued in high school? In college? Assuming the implied agreement that more writing by students would be required at all levels and that this writing would include many short papers, it was agreed that indications of planning and organizing materials presented were among the desirable qualities. The advice of both groups of teachers was to have the student write

simply on simple subjects, with simple standards of clarity, completeness, and purposeness as the goals. If time is given by the student to thinking about and limiting his subject, to sequentializing his materials, and to writing with a specific purpose and a specific audience in mind, matters of clarity, completeness, and purposeness will, in part, be cared for.

Question 5: Can something be gained for integration by having high school teachers criticize the writing of college students and college teachers criticize the writing of high school students? The workshop thought so and brought up some instances of reciprocal reading of student papers, in the integration programs in Kentucky, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and Texas.

Question 6: Can English departments in both high schools and colleges elicit help in holding student writing to respectable standards from their colleagues in other departments? It was suggested that so-called "standards of communication"—in terms of modern linguistic findings—could and should be discussed with and among fellow faculty members, requesting their help in helping maintain such "standards."

Question 7: Should the many-paged investigative paper be assigned in high school? The college teachers doubted that such a paper should be assigned in high school or even in freshman composition in college, but the high school teachers presented the convincing argument that such a paper—utilizing as it does the acquisition of techniques that are important not only in college but in life as well—was important, especially for those students who would not go to college.

The workshop accepted this argument and recommended that the high school teachers do some work with investigative papers and hoped that mere length

would not be a substitute for trustworthy investigation. In addition, it was indicated that a study by the pupil of himself and of his own potentials was and would be a fit subject for investigation or research as well as the other more commonly accepted subjects for "research."

Question 7: What effect upon the teaching of English can be observed as the result of the progression, uninterrupted by failures, from the grades to college? The college teachers felt that the practice of passing students regardless of their progress in language proficiency results in lowered standards in reading, speaking, and writing, and the high school teachers agreed in the main. But the plain fact is that the practice is with us and is likely to remain. An extension of integration of the teaching of English in high schools and colleges is one way of helping the situation.

These questions, of course, are only a few of the many posed. The discussions were full and sober. There was much give and take in the discussions with some points being vigorously upheld and attacked. Not infrequently a vigorous supporter of an idea modified his views. In general, the sentiment of the workshop seemed to be that the questions and their discussions resulted in much benefit. This led to the conviction that integration programs should be extended to all states.

In review, the workshop devoted itself to these matters: It was agreed by the college teachers that they desired the high school teachers of composition to require more planned and impromptu writing, and this all along the way. The high school teachers agreed that more writing by students was desirable but suggested that they were requiring more writing than their students were admitting to when questioned by their college teachers. In general, all agreed that the

type of writing should be, for the most part, expository in nature.

Among those matters interfering with better teaching of composition and, consequently, with better integration of effort, the workshop agreed, were these: too few teachers teach too many students; high school teachers have too many extracurricular activities, especially in the smaller schools; there are too many teachers of composition who do not understand the importance of descriptive as opposed to prescriptive language study—in short, too many teachers ill-equipped for the teaching of composition; there is too little study by English teachers of modern linguistic findings and suggestions; there is too little attention paid by other faculty members to upholding reasonably decent standards; and there is too little help and direction from the colleges as to what should be taught in high school.

The workshop urged that English teachers take the "integration bull" by the horns and do something about scheduling, teacher loads, the assigning of more writing, untrained teachers, and other related matters. This could be accomplished by discussion of the matters within departments, between departments, within schools, and between high schools and colleges. Something could be accomplished by bringing these matters to the attention of high school and college administrators on a national scale by utilizing their respective professional journals. An unrelenting and an integrated attack over a period of time might produce results.

Colleges should take the initiative in cooperating with high schools by arranging meetings between staffs, but if they do not, the high schools should arrange such meetings. (College teachers present indicated that they were eager to cooperate, but sometimes were reluc-

ta
ch
th
at
sta
op
stu
ch

gr
oth
po
ma
ter

Cha
M
Co-
T
(a
Sec
S
Co-
sh
Res
So
Rut
In
Mrs
le
G. C
ba
Clar
Il
Mrs
Ch
Sist
Pe
Carl
H

tant to push the matter because of the charge that colleges want to dominate the secondary school program.) Cooperation between high school and college staffs might extend practices already in operation here and there of exchanging student papers and arranging for exchanging teachers.

In addition to those integration programs already reported by workshops at other CCCC meetings (see previous reports in *College Composition and Communication*), this workshop calls attention to these programs:

1. Kentucky. In 1952, the University of Kentucky, in cooperation with six other Kentucky colleges and some twenty-odd Kentucky high schools, developed a program of integration of effort in teaching composition.
2. Illinois. The April, 1953, issue of the *Illinois English Bulletin* reports on efforts at integration in Illinois.
3. *The New England Quarterly*

(Fall, 1952) has an article on integration in New England.

4. Texas. The Conference of College Teachers of English and the Texas State Teachers Association cooperate in sponsoring annually eleven workshops in as many geographical areas of the state. Each workshop deals with the problems of standards and of integrating the efforts of high schools and colleges in improving student writing. The secretary of the central committee is Dr. Margaret Lee Wiley, East Texas State College, Commerce.
5. Roosevelt High School, East Chicago, Indiana, sends out from and for its seniors a questionnaire to a list of colleges requesting information about college courses in composition. It uses the replies in helping seniors prepare themselves for college English.
6. The workshop heard various reports of projects in integration that are about to be launched.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 12

Chairman: Stewart S. Morgan, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station
Co-Chairman: Robert H. Carpenter, New Trier Township High School, Winnetka, Illinois (absent because of illness)
Secretary: James H. Mason, Indian Springs School, Helena, Alabama
Co-Secretary: David Cameron, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois
Resource: Isabel Kincheloe, South Shore High School, Chicago, Illinois
 Ruth B. Bozell, Arsenal Technical High School, Indianapolis, Indiana
 Mrs. Georgeann Burge, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo
 G. C. Camp, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Clarence Clifford, Scott-Foresman Co., Chicago, Illinois
 Mrs. Jenny Cohler, Von Steuben High School, Chicago, Illinois
 Sister Mary David, Villa Maria Academy, Erie, Pennsylvania
 Carl R. Dolmetsch, Oak Park and River Forest High School, Oak Park, Illinois

Wilma R. Ebbitt, College, University of Chicago, Illinois
 Kenneth C. Ettner, Elgin Community College, Elgin, Illinois
 George P. Faust, University of Kentucky, Lexington
 Morris Finder, Dunbar Trade School, Chicago, Illinois
 W. N. Francis, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
 Charles H. Green, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
 Ruth Henline, Illinois State Normal University, Bloomington
 Elsa Henzel, Marshall High School, Chicago, Illinois
 Max T. Hohn, Oak Park and River Forest High School, Oak Park, Illinois
 Mrs. Susan Holden, West Virginia University, Morgantown
 J. N. Hook, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Medeed P. Hulow, Marshall High School, Chicago, Illinois
 Victor W. Koepsell, Eel River-Perry Schools, Huntertown, Indiana, and Indiana University Center, Fort Wayne

Mrs. Gladys Kronsagen, Glenbard High School, Glen Ellyn, Illinois

Ellendore Lampton, Proviso Township High School, Maywood, Illinois

Merrilee Mather, Eastern Illinois State College, Charleston

Frederick T. McGill, Jr., Rutgers University, Newark, New Jersey

Dora May Mitchell, Marshall College, Huntington, West Virginia

Don Osborne, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio

Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Frank Ross, *The English Journal*, Chicago, Illinois

Elizabeth H. Rusk, University of Illinois, Urbana

Lucile Schieling, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois

Edith E. Shepherd, University of Chicago Latin School, Chicago, Illinois

Parmeta J. Simpson, Phillips High School, Chicago, Illinois

Irwin J. Suloway, Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Illinois

Isabelle Swatts, Roosevelt High School, East Chicago, Indiana

Helen G. Todd, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois

Waters Turpin, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland

Father Ferdinand Ward, St. Louis Preparatory Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri

The Mass Media of Communication

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 13

Douglas Waples and Kenneth Adler of the University of Chicago Division of Social Sciences were listed technically as chairman and co-secretary respectively of the workshop on mass media of communication, but they made it clear from the outset that they felt they could be of greatest value by serving in the role of resource persons or consultants.

Dr. Waples opened the workshop by indicating that he felt his primary contribution should be a description of the graduate program in communication at the University of Chicago, after which he would turn the meeting over to the co-chairman, David White. He described the formation of the University of Chicago "Committee on Communication," of which he is chairman, outlined the purposes of the Committee, and explained the program it has established. The Committee does not grant degrees but provides a field which may be selected by students in several departments or schools as part of their program leading to a Master's or Doctor's degree.

Mr. Adler, who teaches the core sequence offered by the Committee, followed Dr. Waples with additional comments on the program at Chicago and on objectives of study and research in

the area of communication in general. Among the objectives he suggested such problems as the economic organization of the mass media, their effect on society and special groups, and the way in which meaning is communicated at the mass media level. As possible questions for consideration by the workshop, he suggested the following:

1. What techniques of communication research can we use effectively in freshman courses?
2. How can we guard against generalization and oversimplification in the conclusions of our students?
3. To what extent can mass media material be used in the Freshman English classroom?
4. To what extent is the formal intelligence a college freshman receives reinforced by what he reads or hears over mass media? Is there a conflict between mass media and formal intelligence?
5. Is there such a thing as a critical reading skill? If there is, what specifically is it that a critical reader does which the casual reader does not do?

6. How can our students be taught to make better use of existing mass media in their personal lives?
7. How can we guard against the danger that the student, in learning to reserve judgement and read critically, will come to regard the search for truth as too hopelessly complex and become cynical?

During the second session, with Mr. White serving as chairman, it was suggested that each member of the workshop give a brief description of what was being done with mass communication in the freshman courses of his college, and also suggest the problems which he felt were especially pertinent. The individual contributions revealed that approximately one-third of those attending the workshop were interested in incorporating material on the mass media in their own programs but had not actually done so as yet. For the rest, activities ranged from occasional discussion of the local newspaper to the more complete programs at the University of Minnesota and St. Cloud State Teachers College, where a full quarter's work is built around the study of the mass media. One of the most interesting individual reports in this section of the meeting was a description by Mrs. White, wife of the co-chairman, of how a freshman class she was teaching had had an opportunity to compare a *Life* magazine report on Formosa with a first hand oral report by a student in the college from Formosa. The discrepancies between the two reports were startling, she said, and yet they could scarcely have been recognized by a well-trained reader unless he had such first-hand knowledge to check against the magazine report.

The reports and problems suggested by individual members at the second ses-

sion indicated that there was general agreement that mass communication media should be studied as part of the Freshman English sequence. However, there was no clearly recognizable pattern of agreement as to the techniques to be used or of the specific objectives to be attained.

During the third session, Mr. Adler demonstrated a content-analysis technique which he and some colleagues at the University of Chicago had developed. The technique was described as a refinement of the more widely used quantitative analysis approach in an effort to bring in some measurable aspects of qualitative analysis as well. All members of the workshop brought in copies of *The Chicago Tribune* for that morning. Some members brought in both early and late editions for comparison, and also copies of other morning papers such as *The Chicago Sun-Times*, *The New York Times*, and *The New York Herald Tribune*. Mr. Adler selected a story on the Congressional investigation of the ex-wife of Senator Douglas and of an Ohio State University scientist, formerly of Chicago, Professor Darling. He analyzed the story in detail for loaded words and evidence of slanting, and he showed how the position given to the story (it appeared on an inside page), the emphasis in the lead, and so on, would be compared with treatment of the same story in other papers in order to rate the story on a scale that would indicate the degree of political bias it contained.

This demonstration, which most of the workshop members seemed to feel was of practical value to them, occupied most of the final session, and there was not sufficient time for formulating any set of general conclusions about mass media in the freshman course before adjournment.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 13

Chairman: Douglas Waples, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
Co-Chairman: David White, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota
Secretary: William Donnelly, St. Cloud State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
Co-Secretary: Kenneth P. Adler, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
 Sister M. Amarella, St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Indiana
 Orville Baker, Northern Illinois State College, DeKalb
 James W. Byrd, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, Tennessee
 Mollie Cohen, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois
 Claude Coleman, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Richard J. Crohn, New American Library
 Mildred F. Cross, Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Arkansas
 Paul L. Evett, Central Michigan College, Mt. Pleasant
 Roscoe Faunce, Graceland Junior College, Lamoni, Iowa
 Louis Hasley, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

Eleanor Hoag, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas
 Barry Marks, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 D. E. McCoy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 George McElroy, Indiana University, Gary Center, Gary
 Ray Mizer, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Indiana
 Joseph Pattison, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York
 Dorothy L. Sheldon, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Eunice H. Smith, St. Cloud State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
 Anna Lee Stensland, Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, South Dakota
 Jane W. Stedman, University of Chicago (student), Chicago, Illinois
 Helen Stevens, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois
 Warren I. Titus, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee
 Beverly White, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota
 Arthur Wormhoudt, St. Cloud State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Clinical Aids to Freshman English

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 14

The first session of this workshop was devoted entirely to descriptions by each panel member of the nature of their communication programs and the nature of the clinical aids that were available to them at their respective institutions. The programs described varied considerably in respect to clinical aids; they ranged from a situation in which improvement services were extensive and available outside of the regular course to a situation in which few aids were available and those that were had to be utilized in the regular classroom.

Following the descriptions, the members of the panel considered the following problems:

I. *How can remedial programs be staffed?* The following possibilities were suggested: graduate assistants, the regular instructor, any instructor in the college, or any part-time help. None of

these suggestions were found to be desirable, however; this was due to either the person's lack of time or lack of training or both. Most of the members felt that the problem involved doing a selling job to administrations in order to get funds for this special problem. Extra instructors should be hired who not only are trained for the job but whose time will be devoted to the job.

II. *For the small college, is it necessary to have separate clinics or may the individual instructor handle the problems?* The members agreed that the instructor should not handle the severe speech problems that arise. It was felt that the teacher may handle the other problems but that a more desirable arrangement would be to provide the department with a special staff member who would be trained.

III. *Should grades and credit be given*

en for the clinical work? Three points of view were presented. First, improvement or clinical work should be graded. A criticism of this method was that no element of penalty should be associated with the improvement program. Also, it was felt that there is no adequate basis on which improvement grades can be determined. Second, improvement work should not be graded but should be influential in the determination of the regular communication course grade. This method appeared more acceptable to the members of the panel; however, much of the same criticism still pertains. The third method and the one deemed to be the most advantageous to the student was that improvement or clinical work should not be graded and no credit should be given.

IV. *What devices or techniques can be utilized in the improvement of read-*

ing and/or writing? Several mechanical devices were suggested: the Harvard films and tachistoscope were especially recommended for reading improvement; the opaque projector was recommended as being very useful in teaching writing and also reading. Even more important than the mechanical devices suggested were the teaching techniques suggested by the members. The relationship among reading, writing, and speaking was stressed; the recommendation was made that each class assignment should include all three of the channels of communication, rather than just one.

V. *What should be done for the student who has a speech problem?* The consensus was that, although the communication instructor may be able to handle some of the speech problems, the best policy would be to refer the student with the speech disorder to the speech clinic or improvement service.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP No. 14

Chairman: Frederic E. Reeve, Michigan State College, East Lansing.

Co-Chairman: Amy H. Dale, St. Cloud State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Secretary: Davis A. Scott, Indiana University, Bloomington

Co-Secretary: Jerome Kovalcik, Champlain College, State University of New York, Plattsburg

T. R. Cogswell, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Wallace W. Douglas, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Walter J. Engler, Wisconsin State College, River Falls

E. E. Foelber, Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Marvin M. Fisher, General Motors Institute of Technology, Flint, Michigan

Ruth Anderson Maxwell, James Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois

Carl S. McClain, Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Illinois

Joseph McKee, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo

Vivian Newport, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois

C. H. Scaer, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois

Gracia T. Sheldon, Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Carrie E. Stanley, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Carl J. Stratman, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois

Albert C. Tillman, University of Illinois, Urbana

Ina H. Unglesby, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge

R. D. Williams, Wisconsin State College, Superior

The English Language Arts

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 15

Workshop No. 15 met to consider Volume I of the N.C.T.E. Curriculum Series, *The English Language Arts*. The discussion was primarily concerned with the relation of Freshman English to the basic philosophy of the book, the recommended integrated courses, and the statement of goals. As the discussion progressed, the following ideas became dominant.

The developmental philosophy of *The English Language Arts* faces squarely the issues of a student-centered or a subject-centered curriculum; the goal of growth or of mastery in an area; and the problem of evaluation in terms of growth. If the teachers of English accept the philosophy of growth with its stress on individual differences and integrated courses, college English departments will need to reconsider the training of teachers and provide a much richer background than the one which is now provided. Although better tests are needed to prove scientifically that integrated courses are superior, those who have had experience with them feel that they are the preferred type of course. The teachers of integrated courses in Freshman English, like those of the standard courses, are responsible for writing skill,

but they approach it as only one medium in the whole communication process. These teachers feel that integrated or broad courses are superior because they help the student see relationships; they are more challenging to both the teacher and the student; and they require continual study and growth on the part of the teaching staff.

The stated goals in *The English Language Arts* are goals for youth to be achieved through all aspects of education and must be viewed relatively in relation to the college English curriculum. The teacher of Freshman English is directly responsible for some of them, but only to a limited extent for others, and then indirectly in many instances. Readers must keep in mind that the book, as the first volume of the series, is concerned with all levels from the kindergarten through college, and any study of it must consider that fact. Final evaluation for any level must await the forthcoming volumes in the series; Volume IV, *The College Teaching of English*, is now in preparation.

The English Language Arts, a stimulating book to most and a provoking one to some, represents a philosophy toward which all education seems to be moving.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 15

Chairman: Rachel Salisbury, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee

Co-Chairman: J. W. Ashton, Indiana University, Bloomington

Secretary: Jane Dale, Oregon College of Education, Monmouth

Co-Secretary: Alfred Ames, Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Illinois

Alvin Almer, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois

Sister Marie Ancille, Ottumwa Heights College and Academy, Ottumwa, Iowa

Paul M. Bechtel, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

K. C. Bennett, Scott, Foresman and Co., Chicago, Illinois

Joseph E. Brewer, Baldwin Wallace College, Berea, Ohio

Lillian M. Budge, State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota

J. Hal Connor, Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb

Mrs. J. Hal Connor, Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb

Sister Mary David, Villa Maria Academy, Erie, Pennsylvania

Arthur E. Diesing, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois

Matthew Evans, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

Robert J. Greef, Central Missouri State, Warrensburg

Erich T. Griebeling, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

Harvey R. Goslee, Ronald Press, New York City

Janet Jansen, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Falk S. Johnson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago

Herbert C. Kalk, Wilson Junior College, Chicago, Illinois

R. A. Miller, University of Wisconsin, Madison

David H. Minnick, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois

Joseph Pattison, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Charles W. Roberts, University of Illinois, Urbana

Howard Sawatzky, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

Lucille Schilling, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois

David C. Sheldon, University of Wisconsin Extension, Milwaukee

Helen Siml, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

Gerald H. Thorson, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Helen G. Todd, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois

The Psychology of the Student: How He Learns to Communicate

THE REPORT OF WORKSHOP NO. 16

The workshop began with a discussion of an article by co-chairman John Fisher, "On Attitudes toward Language Study," which suggested reasons for student resistance to language study. The group decided that it would first have to agree on the function of a freshman writing course before it could analyze the freshman. It was generally agreed that such a course should be not only remedial (in the sense that it repair any inadequacies in the student's use of "standard" English), but that it should also enlarge the student's understanding of language and his ability to use it for communication and for self-expression. It was also felt that, since a person's language activity is an integral part of his behavior, the growth of the student's intellect and personality was a proper concern of the instructor of freshman writing, and that therefore such courses should not be narrowly vocational but rather fashioned to fit into the general education or humanities program, with proper allowance for the purpose of the school and the type of student it has.

The workshop then returned to the psychology of student writing. It was pointed out that a child's natural interest in language gives way at puberty to interest in abstract thought, and that any attempt to make an adolescent self-con-

scious about his use of language must necessarily upset his equilibrium. The problem is intensified by the fact that, since one's writing is felt, sub-consciously, to be a projection of one's self, the traces of a correcting and instructing pencil are not only resented but often even resisted as a personal attack. The group found no solution to this problem other than the instructor's constant awareness of it and his attempt to balance an optimum amount of self-consciousness on the part of the student (to further his improvement and his increasing awareness of how language can be used successfully) against a minimum amount of student inhibition and resistance.

Other related problems were discussed. It was suggested that some of the college man's resistance to freshman English may be due to the fact that the greater maturity of the girls in high school enables them generally to write better than do the boys and that the college male's shying at a writing course may be a manifestation of his desire to avoid a situation in which he has not been able to compete successfully. The suggestion was made that a student who is particularly inhibited might dictate his first few themes to overcome his resistance to writing. It was further noted

that our time accentuates the problem (the more complex society gets, the greater the need for and the more complex is communication); that sometimes we offer the student modes of handling complex ideas when he is not yet capable of such complex thinking; that polished communication and having something to say are not necessarily concomitant attributes and that encouraging either or both to different degrees in different students (to say nothing of assigning a grade) causes difficulty; that our moral attitude toward language, with emphasis on "right" and "wrong," causes emotional involvements in the student; that mass education inevitably makes the solving of these problems more difficult.

The workshop then discussed methods of motivating the student which might help in overcoming some of these obstacles. It was generally agreed that the student's greatest use of language beyond that of satisfying his personal needs (for which his mastery has always been quite satisfactory) is to achieve status: to gain entry into a group, or to climb in a group of which he is already a member. If he is not conscious of this function of language, it can easily be brought to his attention and perhaps be used as a motivating factor in awakening his interest in matters of usage. It was also felt that the instructor should impress upon the student the facts that adequate use of language is necessary in a democratic society which places a premium on intelligent participation in all phases of social activity and that business and industry are eager for people who speak and write well. If the student can be made to understand that his ability to use language may well be an important factor in his personal success, such an understanding may provide powerful motivation. In this connection it was pointed out that since society has foisted

upon the English instructor the teaching of a standard of speech and writing, we would do well to be realistic about the problem and encourage the student to be realistic about it also. Some members of the workshop felt that requiring a student to keep a tally sheet of his errors would encourage him to be aware of his writing problems and thus more critical of his own writing.

The group felt that it was important to help the student to evaluate his own growth and needs in communication and made several suggestions to that end. Conferences were thought to be extremely helpful for this purpose, although it was recognized that when the instructor goes beyond the normal two or three conferences per student per semester the demand of such activity on his time is prohibitive. It was also suggested that the instructor's not assigning grades for the first three or four themes would encourage the student to be critical of his own work, as would reading themes aloud (with proper precautions taken to hide the identity of the author) for class criticism.

At the final meeting of the workshop, Mr. Robert Havighurst was the resource person. With his help, the group discussed how the student's personality and his personality problems affect his writing and the subjects he should write about. By means of case studies, Mr. Havighurst explained what he felt were the three personality factors necessary to effective communication:

1. Observation: awareness of externals, of what is going on in the world around one.
2. Insight: intellectual awareness of other people; being able to predict what other people will do.
3. Empathy: (a non-intellectual trait) putting one's self in the place of others in feeling; being

able to feel as another person feels.

While a year's instruction in English probably cannot modify these deep-laid factors to any great extent, the group agreed that an instructor might well guide a student's reading, writing, and speaking so as to capitalize on the strong points the student has and strengthen his weak points. Many schools, it was pointed out, assign autobiographical papers either as part of the testing program which every student goes through after entrance or at the beginning of the year in freshman English. Some members of the workshop felt that such material would be useful to the instructor in understanding and assigning topics for the student. No agreement could be reached on whether the student should write personal narrative (it was particularly recommended by some as a good way to start the semester). Some members of the workshop argued strongly for this approach (largely on the grounds that the student is more interested in his own problems than in anything else); and, others argued just as strongly against it (largely on the grounds that the student is too emotionally involved in his own problems to be able to see them objectively or write coherently about them). As a possible solution of this dilemma, the group also discussed having the student write about subjects related to his personal problems (i.e., problems of human relations) as a way of assuring objectivity and at the same time keeping the writing within the area of the student's strongest interest.

From this discussion there arose the problem of the frequency with which the English instructor is called upon to act as student counselor because of his peculiar position (i.e., frequent conferences, often personal subject matter of themes, close relation between the student's writing and his intellectual and

emotional maturity and development). Many members of the workshop expressed concern not only over the amount of time this unofficial counseling consumed, but also over the responsibility involved, particularly since few English instructors have the training necessary for such counseling. Mr. Havighurst suggested that the English teacher could be a sympathetic audience for a student who wants to talk or write about personal problems and that as long as the teacher refrained from telling the student what to do he would probably do no harm and might do some good.

Mr. Havighurst also pointed out that in handling adolescents it is wise to let them know within what limits they are to function and then give them considerable freedom within those limits. Certain minima of communication skills, for example, might well be set up as necessary of attainment. Mr. Havighurst felt not only that adolescents need some standards to work for, but also that if adults do not set standards the young people think that they do not care.

The following topics were recommended for student writing because they are within the realm of the student's experience and interest:

1. A news-letter to be sent to the student's high school advising the seniors there what it is like to enter college and how best to prepare for it.
2. Letters to college authorities analyzing various aspects of the curriculum and extra-curricular activities and making recommendations for changes (here the student could be asked to put himself in the place of the recipient of the letter in order to judge best what approach to take).

3. Letters to the college paper on student problems, and

4. Letters to the local papers on current problems.

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP NO. 16

Chairman: Erwin R. Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Co-Chairman: John H. Fisher, New York University, New York, New York

Secretary: Mary Elizabeth Fowler, Connecticut State Teachers College, New Britain, Connecticut

Co-Secretary: Hans Gottschalk, Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire

A. B. Becker, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

John F. Choitz, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois

Doris Conklin, Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa

Robert Cristin, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

Edith M. Eichler, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

William B. Eley, American Book Company, New York, New York

Ann Ferguson, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

Lizette Van Gelder, Howard College, Birmingham, Alabama

James R. Green, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania

Ruth G. Van Horn, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

Willis C. Jackman, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago

L. A. King, Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio

Charles R. Lawrence, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Albert H. Marckwardt, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Verna L. Newsome, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee

Lucille A. Nobbs, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo

James U. Rundle, American Book Company, New York, New York

Mary Louise Savage, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri

Herbert Slusser, The College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota

Wright Thomas, State University Teachers College, Cortland, New York

Beryl E. Whitney, University of Wisconsin Extension, Kenosha

E. K. Williams, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Indiana

Arthur Wormhoudt, State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota

CCCC Bulletin Board

Readers of both *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* will have noted, or should note, that the business offices of these magazines, as well as of the National Council of Teachers of English, are now at 8110 South Halsted Street, Chicago 20, Illinois. April *College English* reported: "A relocation of the joint office has been imminent for some time. A fire on February 8 made an immediate move necessary . . . There has, of course, been some interruption of work, with consequent delays in service. No business records were lost except a small file of work in progress used by several people and necessarily kept on a desk. Except for two or three pamphlet publications, business is now proceeding as usual."

If, by any chance, any CCCC mem-

bers or any colleagues that CCCC members know about have missed or are missing receiving any copies of *College Composition and Communication*, a note to the Chicago office should straighten the matter out, to which office any other business correspondence should also be sent. Editorial matters should, as in the past, be sent to the Editor of CCC, University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

A regional conference dealing with "The Freshman Course in English" was held at Youngstown College, Youngstown, Ohio, on Saturday, April 11, with twenty-eight people attending from six colleges in Ohio and Pennsylvania: Geneva, Hiram, Mount Union, Slippery

Rock, Westminster, and Youngstown. At the morning session, "Descriptions of Three Approaches to the Freshman Course" were given as follows: "Separate Presentation of Composition and Speech," Carle B. Spotts, Slippery Rock State Teachers College; "The Course Presented Under the Special Conditions of an Intensive Program," John L. Davis, Hiram College; "Speech and Composition Combined in a Single Course," Hubert C. Howard, Youngstown College. At the afternoon session, "The Implications for the Freshman Course of the Recent NCTE Publication, *The English Language Arts*," the subjects and speakers were: "Its possible effects on primary and secondary English instruction," Kenneth Harris, Slippery Rock; "Its attitude toward college English instruction, particularly on the freshman level," Amy Charles, Westminster College; "What position shall college teachers take towards it and the other studies in the series?" Karl W. Dykema, Youngstown. Considerable discussion followed both the morning and afternoon talks.

The February, 1953, issue of *The Journal of Engineering Education* is the annual yearbook of the American Society for Engineering Education. It lists among other information the names of 147 institutional members, some dating back to 1913. Those who participate—there were 49—in either the Engineering College Administrative Council or the Engineering College Research Council pay an annual membership fee of \$35.00. Those who participate—there were 98—in both councils pay an annual membership fee of \$50.00. The annual report of the ASEE shows that for the year ending June 30, 1951, \$6,661.00 was received from this source; for the year ending June 30, 1952, \$8,105.00; and for the year ending June 30, 1953, an estimated \$9,600.00.

"Your committee feels strongly that there should be fewer set subjects drawn from literature and more theme subjects from the daily life and experiences of the student, for the reason that the student's spontaneity in the earlier years of his college course, does not naturally play about subjects taken from literature. Professor Carpenter of Columbia writes: 'Theme subjects are taken almost entirely from matters lying within the student's experience. We have not secured good results from making the work in literature the basis of composition.' Of the colleges sending information on this point, Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, Institute of Technology, Brown, Williams, Tufts, Amherst, Vassar, and Wellesley report that theme subjects are practically all taken, in the earlier years of the courses, from subjects based on the student's experience.

"The greatest need in college instruction in English, as in secondary schools, is a larger teaching staff in order to secure more time for personal conference . . . The conference is as necessary to the instructor in English as the laboratory to the instructor in science."—Report of the Committee on Methods of Teaching and Study, The New England Association of Teachers of English, 1902 (yes, 1902!). Quoted from *The English Leaflet*, March, 1949.

Let us remember, and let us tell our colleagues in our own institutions and elsewhere, to begin planning now to attend—

The Annual Spring Meeting of the CCCC will be in St. Louis, Missouri, March 4, 5, and 6 (Thursday, Friday, Saturday), at the Jefferson Hotel. As in the past, there will be general sessions, panel discussions, and workshops.

Designed for and limited to circulation among Indiana University students,

"Career Opportunities for Majors in English" was published (May, 1953) in mimeographed form by the Department of English at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. Containing twenty-two pages, the booklet discusses preparation of the English major for and opportunities in such fields as advertising, sales promotion work, and editing; typing, stenography, and general office work; business leadership; civil service; combined pre-law programs; library science; secondary teaching; teaching English at the college level; professional writing; and the book publishing business.

The following is the material given in the section on "Opportunities in Advertising, Sales Promotion Work, and Editing for the A. B. Graduate":

"For students who graduate with the A. B. degree there are careers in business for which training in English with a concentration in writing is particularly usable. These include many types of advertising, sales promotion work, and editing. In February each year an 'Aptitude Examination for Advertising' is sponsored by the American Association of Advertising Agencies for young men and women considering advertising careers. The examination is given to attract high-calibre people to the advertising business. The examination tests aptitudes for advertising planning and merchandising, copy writing, advertising research, radio and television production, etc. In addition to these fields, if a student has ability in writing, many interesting types of sales promotion and editorial work are open to him. Christian K. Arnold, the head of the publications department of the U. S. Naval Civil Engineering Research Laboratory, Port Hueneme, California, explains that 'majors in English make better editors than do technically trained men simply because their training is broader, giving them a better general understanding. Editors at this lab-

oratory, for instance, must work with reports concerning research in almost every branch of engineering, as well as several of the fields of pure science. The broad background of the major in English becomes, in such cases, an asset rather than a liability.' Nearly every large business or manufacturing house has a trade journal which requires staff editors skilled in writing. For these and similar positions, along with his literature courses a student should take work in advanced writing, and the basic courses in psychology, marketing, and advertising."

Note: A brief article, "New Openings for English Majors," by Cecilia H. Hendricks of Indiana University, appears in the September 5, 1953, issue of *School and Society*, pages 75 and 76. It adds details to the brief summary given above.

"Graduate study in technical writing is to be offered by Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute beginning with the next college year [1953-1954]. The degree of master of science is to be awarded on satisfactory completion of two semesters of work. Courses are designed to develop clear, grammatical, and interesting writing on technical subjects. The English department is to direct the program. The Rensselaer master's degree in technical writing is believed to be the first offered in this particular field."—*The Journal of Engineering Education*, January, 1953.

If you have heard of but have not seen the British publication, *The Use of English*, here are a few pertinent facts about it:

Published quarterly, in February, May, September, November.

Now in fifth year—Volume V, No. 1 will appear in November.

Published by Chatto and Windus, 40

William IV Street, W. C. 2, England.

Editor: Denys Thompson; Assistant Editor, J. H. Walsh.

Number of pages in each issue, about 60. Page size: $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

Annual subscription, 12 s. 6 d., including postage.

Unfortunately for the American college teacher, the magazine is designed mainly for the British "public school" English teacher. As a headmaster writes in the Summer, 1953, issue:

"Except for *The Use of English* there is to my knowledge no systematic way whereby the teacher of English in a British school can learn what his colleagues in other schools are attempting or can pass on methods and devices which he himself has found useful. Certainly, such features as 'Useful Lessons,' 'Set Books,' and 'Criticism in Practice' must be among the most welcome sections of the magazine. Apart from their immediate practical value, they help to cure that feeling of isolation, which may daunt the teacher who feels that his struggles are unshared and unappreciated. *The Use of English*—except for occasional excursions into the Training College field—concentrates on teaching in the Schools: to the University teacher a medium for the exchange of accounts of teaching methods at that level might well seem disparaging as well as otiose. We regard our dons as scholars first and teachers second: a notion that they seriously considered their teaching methods would be as shocking to many of their students as it would be to themselves. We stress the responsibility of the student to 'find out for himself'; we don't expect his teacher to make it easy for him."

This same article, however, is a comprehensive and favorable review of "The Exercise Exchange" inaugurated at Bennington College, Vermont—"a co-operative enterprise designed to encourage the

communication of ideas and an exchange of pedagogical devices among teachers of literature [and written composition] in colleges and in secondary schools."

It is the belief of many directors and specialists in composition that no effective teacher of composition can live and be happy by teaching one kind of composition alone. An assignment or two in literature can make a good composition teacher better, as *at least* one class in composition can benefit tremendously both a teacher of literature and his composition students. Even within the freshman year there is variety in composition: the writing laboratory, the subfreshman course, the regular course, the advanced course, and also courses in communication (writing, speaking, reading, listening) when these are offered also with the "traditional" work. Advanced levels of composition include creative writing, journalism courses, short story writing, biography, article writing, reports, and business letters. Those who are interested in the last two mentioned will find invaluable a membership in the American Business Writing Association, \$3.00 a year, 428 David Kinley Hall, Urbana, Illinois; such membership brings eight issues (about sixteen to twenty standard-size mimeographed pages) each academic year of the *ABWA Bulletin*, containing miscellaneous information of interest to teachers of such composition.

With the current semester, changes in freshman and sophomore English requirements at The George Washington University are designed to help students recognize truth in reading and writing and avoid being swayed by slogans or false propaganda. The sequence of required courses in English is as follows: composition in the first semester of the freshman year; modern literature in the

second; traditional and historical backgrounds of literature in the first semester of the sophomore year, and composition in the second semester of that year. The scheduling of a composition course at the end of the sophomore year is designed to assist the practice of composition against a background of literature, ec-

onomics, history, and science studied during the first three semesters of college. Composition will be taught not only as a tool of expression but in terms of giving attention to the reasoning process, the nature of evidence and emotional appeal, the finding of truth both in writing and reading.

Luncheon and Annual Business Meeting

CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

Friday, November 27, 1953

Los Angeles, California

(during annual meeting of the National Council of
Teachers of English)

Presiding: T. A. Barnhart, Associate Chairman, CCCC

Panel Discussion: Freshman Texts in the Light of Linguistics

Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota, Chairman

William Matthews, University of California at Los Angeles

L. M. Myers, Arizona State College

Paul Roberts, San Jose State College

C. V. Wicker, University of New Mexico, Moderator

Francis Christensen, University of Southern California, Recorder